REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's confirmation of receipt of applicants' certified copy of the priority document for the German Patent Application 199 12 239.3, filed March 18, 1999 supporting the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119.

Claims 1-6 and 9-13 remain in the application.   Claim 13 has been amended.

In "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103" item 1 on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-6 and 9-13 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,467,388 to *Redd, Jr. et al.* (hereinafter **REDD**) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,915,008 to *Dulman* (hereinafter **DULMAN**) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes is found on page 6, 7, 10, and 12 of the specification of the instant application. Additional support may be found in the original claims and drawings.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed

that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be

helpful. Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*, a method for

implementing telecommunication services in a

telecommunications network including:

> initiating a telecommunication service to be triggered
>   in response to an event **which differs from a
>   connection setting-up request from a subscriber;**
>
> generating a virtual telephone number in a service
>   control point **after activating the
>   telecommunication service;**
>
> signaling the virtual telephone number to a service
>   provider, the service provider in turn indicating
>   an occurrence of the event;
>
> using a switching point to **transmit the virtual
>   telephone number from the service provider to
>   initiate the telecommunication service** after the
>   occurrence of the event; and
>
> carrying out actions defined for the telecommunication
>   service.

Independent claims 11-13 contain similar language.

Applicants respectfully note that in the specification of the

instant application, the term "virtual telephone number" has

been defined to be generated **"after** activating the

telecommunication service" as recited in claim 1 and claim

11. Other examples of the "virtual telephone number" can be

found in the specification of the instant application.

> The service control point generates a "virtual telephone
> number" which is transmitted to the service provider.
> As soon as the event initiating the service occurs, the
> service provider thus simulates the setting up of a
> connection by attempting to set up a connection using
> the virtual telephone number. In the IN-compatible
> switching point (Service Switching Point), this "virtual
> telephone number" is, however, identified as a service
> call and is passed on to the service control point SCP,
> which has stored the required information such as the
> telephone numbers of the subscribers who are to be
> notified.(page 6, lines 7-17)

The **REDD** reference discloses a method for selectively

blocking incoming calls for selected time periods according

to the access desires of a telephone subscriber. More

specifically, a telephone subscriber may designate selected

access tiers, which allow emergency calls and previously

identified individuals to call without being blocked even

during time periods designated to block calls. To program

the call blocking system the subscriber may call a virtual

number (Col. 12, lines 34-38).

In contrast to the instant application, **REDD** teaches that

this virtual number is clearly associated with "a connection

setting-up request from a subscriber" because the subscriber

dials the virtual number to access the call blocking system.

Thereby making a connection setting-up request between the

subscribers equipment and the call blocking system to

configure the access tiers. Moreover, the virtual number is

clearly present **before** the subscriber activates the call

blocking, as the subscriber must call the virtual number to set the access tiers.

Clearly, **REDD** does not show "initiating a telecommunication service to be triggered in response to an event **which differs from a connection setting-up request from a subscriber**" and "**generating a virtual telephone number** in a service control point **after activating the telecommunication service**" as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

The **DULMAN** reference discloses a system for changing advanced intelligent network (AIN) services from customer premises equipment. In this way, subscribers are able to remotely generate transaction data corresponding to AIN services on customer premises equipment, such as personal computers. The transactional data containing a service request is sent from the personal computer to a firewall server and after complying with appropriate security protocols forwarded to an access server. The access server translates the service request into one or more protocols used by the network elements that provide the requested service.

This translation is a key distinction between **DULMAN** and the instant application. In **DULMAN**, the use of virtual numbers is limited to "e.g. 500, 800, 900" (Col. 9, line18) which can

all be translated into an actual destination number. See

e.*g.*, Col. 9, Lines 1-13, where the SCP 28 of **DULMAN**

translates the dialed 800 number into an actual destination

number. As such the virtual numbers in **DULMAN** are actually

only call diversions used for special service numbers with

special charges (free, premium rate, etc.) associated with

the number. While there may be more than one telephone

extension associated with the incoming call (e.*g.*, a call to

a call center), the call is only forwarded to **ONE** of the **REAL**

numbers. In this manner, the applicants respectfully

traverse the Examiner's characterization that **DULMAN**

discloses "generating a virtual telephone number in a service

control point (SCP 28) after activating the telecommunication

service." Rather **DULMAN** clearly does not generate a virtual

number, but limits its teachings to providing a call

diversion for a special service number to ONE real number.

In contrast, the "virtual number" of the instant application

may represent a group of numbers which contain at least one

extension number for every subscriber who previously

activated the service. After the service call is made to the

virtual number, **ALL** of the registered subscribers (e.g., all

the passengers of a special flight) will be connected to the

announcement or message. See for example; page 11 lines 20-23

or the paragraph bridging page 12 and 13 of the specification

of the instant application. More importantly, this

distinction is shown in the claims of the instant

application.

For example, claim 1 recites "initiating a telecommunication

service to be triggered in response to an event **which differs**

from a connection setting-up request from a subscriber" which

clearly distinguishes the instant application over the

"virtual number" used in **DULMAN** where the virtual number is

part of the connection set-up request. As previously

indicated, claim 1 continues by **"generating a virtual**

telephone number in a service control point **after activating**

the telecommunication service" while **DULMAN DOES NOT** generate

the virtual number, but receives the virtual number from the

subscriber **before** activating the service.

Clearly, **DULMAN** and **REDD** does not show "initiating a

telecommunication service to be triggered in response to an

event **which differs from a connection setting-up request from**

a subscriber" and **"generating a virtual telephone number** in a

service control point **after activating the telecommunication**

service" as recited in claim 1 and claim 11 of the instant

application.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1, 11, 12, and 13. Claims 1 and 11-13 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6 and 9-13 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of $110.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

If an extension of time is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Any extension fee associated therewith should be charged to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Kyle H. Flindt
Reg. No. 42,539

_K_y_l_ _H._ _F_l_i_n_d_t_____
For Applicants

KHF:cgm

July 1, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101